

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE

FREEDOM MORTGAGE)	
CORPORATION,)	
)	
Plaintiff)	
)	C.A. No. N22L-10-033 FWW
v.)	
)	
VERLYN RAYFIELD,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

Submitted: March 20, 2023

Decided: March 22, 2023

*Upon Defendant Verlyn Rayfield's Motion for Explanation of Order Denying
Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff's Complaint and Motion for Reconsideration.*

ORDER

Janet Z. Charlton, Esquire, Chase N. Miller, Esquire, MCCABE, WEISBERG & CONWAY, LLC, 1407 Foulk Road, Suite 204, Wilmington, DE 19803, Attorneys for Plaintiff Freedom Mortgage Corporation.

Verlyn Rayfield, 821 W. 32nd Street, Wilmington, DE 19802, Defendant.

WHARTON, J.

This 22nd day of March 2023, upon consideration of Defendant Verlyn Rayfield's ("Rayfield") Motion for Explanation of Order Denying Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff's Complaint and Motion for Reconsideration,¹ and the record in this case, it appears to the Court that:

1. Freedom Mortgage Corporation ("Freedom") brought this mortgage foreclosure action on October 19, 2022.² Freedom alleges that George Rayfield and Verlyn Rayfield ("Rayfield") executed and delivered a mortgage on the property known as 821 W. 32nd Street, Wilmington, Delaware.³ Freedom further alleges that it is the assignee of the mortgage.⁴ George Rayfield died on June 9, 2021, leaving Rayfield the surviving tenant by the entirety.⁵ Freedom alleges that Rayfield has failed to pay installments on the mortgage and now owes Freedom \$199,371.96 in principal together with interest and assorted other charges.⁶

2. Rayfield filed a Motion to Dismiss, accompanied by an Affidavit in Support of Motion to Dismiss setting out the grounds for dismissal.⁷ On February

¹ Def.'s Mot. For Explanation, D.I.

² Compl., D.I. 1.

³ *Id.*

⁴ *Id.*

⁵ *Id.*

⁶ *Id.*

⁷ Def.'s Mot. to Dismiss, D.I. 18.

17, 2023, the Court issued its Order denying her Motion to Dismiss.⁸ Rayfield then asked the Court to reconsider its denial of her Motion to Dismiss on February 24th.⁹ The Court denied that Motion on March 3rd.¹⁰

3. Rayfield's current motion asks the Court to explain those two Orders. The Court declines. The two Orders not only speak for themselves, but the Superior Court Civil Rules do not provide for repetitive reconsideration or explanation of the Court's rulings. The bottom line for Rayfield is that her attempt to dismiss the complaint on the grounds she asserted in her Motion to Dismiss did not persuade the Court. The litigation will now move forward on the usual track.

THEREFORE, Defendant Verlyn Rayfield's Motion for Explanation of Order Denying Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff's Complaint and Motion for Reconsideration is **DENIED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/ Ferris W. Wharton
Ferris W. Wharton, J.

⁸ *Freedom Mortgage Corporation v. Rayfield*, 2023 WL 2134977 (Del. Super. Ct. Feb. 17, 2023).

⁹ Def.'s Mot. for Reconsideration, D.I. 34.

¹⁰ *Freedom Mortgage Corporation v. Rayfield*, 2023 WL 2346400 (Del. Super. Ct. Feb. 17, 2023).